

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 21, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claim 16 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search. Claims 1-18 are respectfully submitted for reconsideration.

The Office Action indicated that claims 16 was objected to for containing a minor informality. Applicant has amended claim 16 to remove the redundant word “are” from the claim recitations. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lord et al. (US 6,763,012 – hereinafter Lord). The rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

Claim 15 is directed to an apparatus that includes a plurality of transmission units, where each of the transmission units are configured to communicate with a network device using a single packet data context and where each of the transmission units has a unique internet protocol address.

Claim 16 is directed to an apparatus that includes a plurality of transmission means for communicating information in a communications network, where each of the transmission means are configured to communicate with a network device using a single

packet data context and where each of the transmission means has a unique internet protocol address.

The Office Action alleged that Lord discloses all of the subject matter recited in claims 15-16, and relied on FIGS. 1-5, the Abstract, and columns 2-4 of Lord as allegedly providing support for the features recited in claims 15-16 of the present application. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Lord teaches the subject matter recited in claims 15-16.

Lord is directed to a general packet radio service (GPRS) network that includes a mobile terminal (MT) and a plurality of user equipment devices (UE) that connect to the GPRS network through the MT. The problem identified by Lord's disclosure is the lack of unique IP addresses per UE devices during a single cellular connection between a MT and a GPRS network (see column 1, line 52 – column 2, line 5 of Lord). There is no discussion regarding the need or implementation of a single packet data protocol (PDP) context for more than one UE device. Applicant submits that Lord fails to disclose “a plurality of transmission units...each of the plurality of transmission units are configured to communicate with a network device using a single packet data context”, as recited, in part, in claim 15 and similarly in claim 16. (Emphasis added)

Referring to column 2 of Lord, there are two embodiments discussed briefly with regard to assigning multiple IP addresses to UE devices that connect to a GPRS network via a MT. The first embodiment describes how the MT receives a plurality of IP addresses from a packet data network (PDN). The first embodiment does not disclose

that a single PDP context is used for more than one UE devices. The second embodiment describes how “a separate PDP context” is used for “each device on the LAN” (see column 2, lines 33-34 and lines 50-52). The second embodiment is clearly contrary to the subject matter recited in claim 15, which recites “using a **single** packet data context.”

Referring to column 4 of Lord, a connection procedure is described that includes “a single PDP Context activation procedure” (see column 4, lines 25-27 of Lord). The PDP context activation procedure establishes a PDP context for the MT and not the user equipment (see column 4, lines 37-40 and lines 62-67, and column 4 line 67 – column 5 line 2 of Lord). The PDP context activation procedure is established with the MT and the procedure does not include a establishing a single PDP context with a plurality of UE devices such that the plurality of UE devices are configured to communicate with a network device using a single packet data context. Lord simply does not establish that one single PDP context is used for more than one UE device to communicate with the MT.

Lord further discloses that for a GPRS type of system, a one-to-one relationship is established with respect to the number of PDP contexts set up per number of UE devices (see column 5, lines 54-60). The type of GPRS system disclosed by Lord is what is described by the prior art of the present application (see page 1, line 31 – page 2 line 5 of the present application). Lord does not address a single PDP context for a plurality of UE devices. Lord fails to disclose “a plurality of transmission units...each of the plurality of

transmission units are configured to communicate with a network device using a single packet data context”, as recited, in part, in claim 15 and similarly in claim 16.

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, Lord fails to disclose all of the subject matter recited in independent claims 15-16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-16 is kindly requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Lord et al. (US 6,763,012 – hereinafter Lord). The rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

As stated in detail above, Lord does not disclose that a single packet data context is used with more than one IP address of a corresponding plurality of participants. Lord does not teach “activating a packet data context for data transmission between identified participants...associating one packet data context with all of the internet protocol addresses of the participants”, as recited, in part, in claim 1. In addition, Lord also does not disclose “wherein the first unit and the second unit are configured to associate one packet data context with all of the internet protocol addresses of the participating units”, as recited, in part, in claim 11. The teachings of Lord do not disclose the above noted features of claims 1 and 11.

Therefore, the subject matter disclosed in Lord does not teach all of the features recited in claims 1 and 11, and for at least that reason a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 1 and 11. By virtue of dependency, Lord

also fails to render obvious the subject matter recited in claims 2-7, 9, 12-13 and 17-18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 11-13 and 17-18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord in view of Ravishankar et al. (US 2003/0060210 – hereinafter Ravishankar). The Office Action stated that Lord fails to teach or suggest one packet data context for one quality of service, and then relied on Ravishankar to disclose such a feature. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As presented above, Lord fails to disclose or suggest each limitation of claims 1 and 11, from which claims 8 and 14 depend. Similarly, a combination of Lord and Ravishankar fails to disclose or suggest each limitation of claims 8 and 14 because Ravishankar fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lord.

Ravishankar discloses a method and system for providing communications services. In one embodiment, a type of communications service present in a communications session is determined based on quality of service (QoS) parameters assigned for the communications session. The quality of service parameters then are adjusted based on a different type of communications service requested. The types of communications services include real-time (e.g., a voice over Internet protocol, VoIP, video/audio on demand, etc.) and non-real-time (e.g., data, web browsing, FTP, etc.) communications services. The services are provided in a communications system, such as a general packet radio service (GPRS) communications system

However, Ravishankar fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “activating a packet data context for data transmission between identified participants...associating one packet data context with all of the internet protocol addresses of the participants”, as recited, in part, in claim 1, from which claim 8 depends, and similarly recited in claim 11. Because Ravishankar fails to cure the deficiencies of Lord with respect to claims 1 and 11, Ravishankar also fails to teach all of the subject matter recited in claims 8 and 14 which depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn because the combination of Lord and Ravishankar fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord in view of Kumaki et al. (US 2002/0191562 – hereinafter Kumaki). The Office Action stated that Lord fails to teach or suggest a mobile station sending a request for releasing the IP address, and then relied on Kumaki to disclose such a feature.

As presented above, Lord fails to disclose or suggest each limitation of claim 1, from which claim 10 depends. Similarly, a combination of Lord and Kumaki fails to disclose or suggest each limitation of claim 10 because Kumaki fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lord.

Kumaki discloses a router device, datagram transfer method, and communication system for realizing handoff control for mobile terminals. At paragraph [0186], Kumaki mentions that an IP address release request is sent from a mobile terminal to an MSR,

similarly, at paragraph [0552], Kumaki describes how such an IP release request is processed. However, Kumaki fails to disclose or suggest, at least, “activating a packet data context for data transmission between identified participants...associating one packet data context with all of the internet protocol addresses of the participants”, as recited, in part, in claim 1, from which claim 10 depends. Because Kumaki fails to cure the deficiencies of Lord with respect to claim 1, Kumaki also fails to teach all of the subject matter recited in claim 10 which depends on claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn because the combination of Lord and Kumaki fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-18 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE/cqc/jeh